

(b) (6)

From: HarborComments <HarborComments@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 8:12 PM
To: PortlandHarbor
Subject: FW: Harbor Comments

-----Original Message-----

From: drupal_admin@epa.gov [mailto:drupal_admin@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2016 8:22 PM
To: HarborComments <HarborComments@epa.gov>
Subject: Harbor Comments

Submitted on 07/20/2016 11:21PM
Submitted values are:

Your Name: (b) (6)
Your Email: (b) (6) Your Comments:

I attended the public meeting and hearing tonight at 1333 NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd today in Portland, Oregon, and I had some concerns about what I heard. In the presentation given by an EPA staff member, she described how dredging and capping would be used for hot spots of contamination, while the rest of the contaminated area that has lower density of contamination would be left to the "technology" of Monitored Natural Restoration (MNR). As to the time frame that was estimated on how long the MNR clean-up would take, this EPA staff-member said that there is a level uncertainty, but the EPA is, I believe the exact words were "quite sure" it would be a "reasonable amount of time."

First, I would like to point out that MNR is not a technology. It is quite literally doing nothing and watching.

Second, when questioned further, the EPA staff present at this meeting and hearing clarified that what they had described as a "reasonable amount of time" is, in fact, at best estimate 30 years. 30 years is not a reasonable amount of time. As of today, I am a young woman, just out of a graduate program and beginning my career. If we follow this plan, then the best estimate is that the river will reach safe levels for fish consumption, etc.

by about the time that I will become eligible for a senior discount at my community center. That is also just according to estimates. Given that MNR- or, sitting back and letting the river do its thing and hoping- will not necessarily do its job within that estimated timeline, or at all, it's possible that the river will not be clean and safe before I am dead.

Given that many Portland families use this river, live on and near this river, and eat from this river- even though they have been warned not to, because they need to or do not understand- 30 years is not acceptable for human health. It is also not acceptable for animal health, for ecological health, for the health of our entire environment and the one downstream. It is also irresponsible, I think, in general to just leave that contaminated sediment in the river. We hope it will be washed away and covered up through MNR. But it will still be there, perhaps to accumulate elsewhere, or to reappear with the next earthquake or other event that might disturb the sediment. And then we have all of that sentiment floating about and sitting on the surface that must be dealt with again.

Why not take this opportunity, for ourselves, for our wildlife, and for our ecosystem, to do a proper job of it? I can think of many reasons to not do otherwise, otherwise being what this plan proposes. The current plan is insufficient. There are parties responsible for this contamination, and they are perfectly capable of paying for a real clean-up that doesn't allow for uncertainty, future repercussions, and failure to comply with health and safety standards in a timely manner. They should have to pay the actual cost of their actions and fix this for good.

I encourage the EPA to consider a stronger plan, with more dredging and proper disposal of contaminants and with less reliance on covering them up or, more importantly, simply leaving them be in order for them to be disposed of (only perhaps, and oh so slowly, and not ever removed properly from the sediment and water of the rivers and ocean) by the river. People and wildlife are suffering from this contamination every day. 30 years is too long.